

Federal worker, and that is akin to about a 10-percent tax increase. That is something we ought not to do in the fashion that we are doing it. That is the purpose of us rising.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to object because there has been an agreement, and very frankly we understand, even if we objected, they could make a motion tomorrow to do the same thing, and I am convinced they would prevail, but I hope we look at this matter very closely. My friend from California said he may agree with me if we affected military retirement in this fashion. We would not want to do that. I say to my colleagues, don't do it to civil service employees any more than you would do it to military personnel in this fashion.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania who asked unanimous consent request, I ask that the Members of Congress realize what this means to them or, more importantly, to their staffs, in fact to all the committees' staffs, all the people who work up here on the Hill. They will see their retirement contribution requirement increased by about 12 percent, from 8 to 9½ percent. On the base that is about a 12-percent increase. They will see their accumulated retirement reduced by 2 percent. So we hit them on the front end in terms of what they contribute and on the back end in terms of what they are able to accumulate toward their retirement, but when we compare that to Federal employees, there was actually a 35-percent increase. That is 2½ percent over the current base of 7 percent, a 35-percent increase over what they are currently paying, plus there will be a reduction in what they are able to receive.

And in the Thrift Savings Plan, which was designed to fix this, which we were committed to sustaining and to not changing, there will be a reduction in the employer contribution, the Federal Government's contribution, from 5 down to 3 percent. This will affect the quality of life is everyone in the Federal Government who is dependent upon a Federal retirement, whether it is in the legislative branch, or the executive branch, or the judiciary branch.

This is a profound change in the assumptions that people have made when they seek and obtain Federal employment and when they plan their retirement years, and yet we get unanimous consent to mark up a bill with a few days notice, and bring it to the floor and make such a profound change with very little consideration.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and just in closing:

We ought to remember approximately 90 percent of private sector employees in America make no contribution to their retirement systems, none. Federal employees are now making a 7-percent contribution. Now, the Federal

employee pension system is a better system than most private sector pension systems. I mentioned that Ronald Reagan signed the bill in which we formed this working with a Republican Senate and a Democrat House.

□ 1845

In 1990, A Democratic Senate and a Democratic House, working with a Republican President, George Bush, tried to reform and did reform the pay system. And the reason President Bush and his administration agreed to that was because they believed, correctly, that pay was not comparable, and they further believed that you ought not to modify in any way the pension system until you got pay comparable.

President Bush then signed the locality bill, the Federal Comparability Pay Act, and said in signing that that he hoped to put the pay and retirement system on a solid base. That is our point. We ought to retain what we have. We ought not to change it and we ought not to do it in this way.

But, again, as I said, Mr. Speaker, I will not object because of the fact that my leadership has agreed to this process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OUR WELFARE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will take up an historic piece of legislation, the welfare reform bill. There has been a lot of discussion about spending on welfare in the context of that bill and there is going to be a special order later this evening which will discuss that further.

I want to talk just for a few minutes not about spending as such, but about the relationship between spending on welfare and the effectiveness of our welfare system. And I am going to do that first by looking at this graph, which is very informative. It shows us how welfare spending has grown since the Great Society programs were announced in the mid-1960's.

What you can see from that, Mr. Speaker, is that in approximately 1965 we were spending about \$30 billion in Federal and State spending on welfare. And that by 1992, we were spending close to \$300 billion on welfare, or a tenfold increase in how much we were

spending on welfare. So we had an explosion in welfare spending on the Federal and State level in the last 30 years.

But look, Mr. Speaker, at what has happened to the poverty rate during that period of time. In 1948, it began a steep decline, down to about 15 percent in approximately 1965, at the same time as welfare spending has exploded and it has stayed the same. It has gone up slightly since 1965.

This vast explosion of welfare spending has brought us not a decrease in poverty but, in fact, a slight increase in poverty and we are entitled to say, why? Why at the same time as we have increased, exponentially, spending on antipoverty programs has poverty stayed the same when it was declining beforehand?

The reason is because of the incentives in the welfare system. The welfare system pays this money only on the condition that people have a child without being married, earlier than they probably otherwise would, and without having a job.

so what the welfare system is doing is destroying work and marriage and family and responsibility. And if you destroy that, it does not matter how much money the government gives somebody, you are not going to get people out of poverty. It is like bailing water out of a boat with one hand while you are pouring water in with the other.

I want to go to the other chart. I only have a few minutes. This is a projection of what is going to happen with welfare spending in the future.

Now, this is a baseline before the welfare reform bill that we are working with that we will be debating next week. You will see that welfare spending is projected to go up from \$300 billion in 1992 to close to \$520 billion by 1998. By that time, it will be almost twice what we spend on defense.

Now, the CBO numbers are not out, Mr. Speaker, so I did not put it on here. The Republican welfare bill we are going to debate allows welfare spending to go up about half that much by the rate of inflation.

And I want to close with a couple of comments. In the first place, nobody in Washington is talking about cuts in welfare. The bill we will debate next week will allow welfare to grow at approximately the rate of inflation. If you hear anybody talking about cuts in welfare, they are either very much mistaken or they are simply uttering something that is not true.

The second point that these two graphs graphically show is how much we are spending on welfare is a lot less important than how we spend it, because values are more important than money. What we have been doing in the past is spending money on welfare in a way that has destroyed families and destroyed work. And so we have gotten not only not less poverty, but more poverty.

What is exciting about our bill is that for the first time we begin spending money on welfare in a way that reinforces family and work and personal responsibility, and that will make a difference for the people caught up in the system.

We take a step for the first time toward ending cash benefits at least for teen moms. We are going to give that money to the States and localities so they can take care of those moms in a way that reinforces family and work instead of destroying it.

And not only are we going to stop punishing people for working, which is what the current system does, we are going to start requiring work so that by the end of the decade about 50 percent of the people on the welfare caseload, and that is an honest number, will have to work in order to get their welfare benefits.

I am going to close, Mr. Speaker, with an observation that my friend Mr. WATTS, our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, often makes. Under the current system we have always measured the success of welfare by how many people we could get on food stamps and AFDC and medicaid and the 70-odd other Federal welfare programs. We measured success by how many people we could get on welfare; by how much money we could spend on welfare. We need to stop doing that because welfare is not a life of dignity and hope for anybody.

We need to start measuring success, and we are going to start measuring success, by how many people we get off of welfare, off the AFDC, off of food stamps, off of medicaid, and into a life of dignity and hope and self-sufficiency which is the American dream. That is what we are offering to people.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are going to be debating next week.

---

#### WE OWE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE REAL WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the 104th Congress has been keeping its promises. From real crime legislation to giving much-needed reform to Federal regulations, we are indeed keeping our promises.

One of our promises to America has been to reform the welfare system. We are going to have the opportunity to change the welfare system within the next few weeks. I would like to share my thoughts with you on where welfare has been and where I would like to see it go.

For over two years, the current administration has promised to end welfare as we know it. For over two years, hard-working taxpayers have been waiting and waiting and waiting. Now, this Congress is going to begin that much-needed reform.

The current welfare system has been a tragic failure. It has encouraged dependency upon government, discouraged responsibility, and cost taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars.

Part of the welfare reform process involves the food stamp reform. That the food stamp delivery system must be reformed, there can be no question. Currently there is an estimated \$2 billion of fraud and abuse involved in the food stamp program annually.

The people of the 7th district of Tennessee who I represent are sick and tired of hearing about such widespread misuse of the food stamp program. They are demanding change and they deserve it.

The Food Stamp Program and Commodity Distribution Act will fight this abuse. It contains stricter penalties for food stamp trafficking, tough fines and forfeiture of ill-gotten gains. It is time we crack down harder on those who abuse food stamps and H.R. 1135 will do just that.

I have always believed that the States are better able to operate the food stamp program. After all, the States are on the frontline, much more so than we here in Washington. Pending legislation will give the States the option and the opportunity to take their food stamp funding in the form of a block grant. It is my hope that the States choose this option. It is the most effective and efficient way of reform.

Another important part of this legislation involves work requirements. It is neither right nor fair for those of us who choose to be responsible, tax-paying citizens to pay the way for someone who chooses to make no effort to be productive. So I don't think it is unreasonable to require someone to work for their benefits. H.R. 1135 does that.

Mr. Speaker, we owe the American people real welfare reform. The pending legislation will begin to provide that reform. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1135 as we begin considering it in the near future.

---

#### THE EMPLOYEE COMMUTE OPTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, the issue I want to speak about tonight involves a mandate imposed by Congress which must be enforced by the EPA. It is a plan that affects many of my constituents in the 16th congressional district of Illinois and many businesses in several cities across the country.

Many governors have called this the most unreasonable, least thought-out, least effective but very, very costly program ever proposed by the U.S. Congress. The plan, employer trip reduction, was mandated under the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990.

Let me explain what this mandate is all about. Section 182(d)(1)(B) of the

Clean Air Act requires employers of 100 or more employees in severe and extreme ozone nonattainment areas to increase passenger occupancy per vehicle in commuting trips between home and the workplace during peak travel periods by not less than 25 percent. The idea is to have people find some other mode of transportation to and from work other than using their car.

The misnomer applied to this mandate is the Employee Commute Option. Some option. If the State elects not to implement this mandate, it stands to lose some of its transportation funds. In Illinois that is \$700 million. In Pennsylvania, it is \$900 million. In some States, fines levied against businesses that do not participate may range into the thousands of dollars.

Areas across the country that face this mandate include Baltimore, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Houston, Milwaukee, Los Angeles, San Diego, Ventura County and Orange County in California. Other affected States include Connecticut, Delaware, New Jersey, and Indiana.

The EPA, in implementing guidelines for this Employee Commute Option, suggests other options for getting to work including mass transit, jogging, bicycle riding, car pooling, and walking.

Well, in the 16th congressional district of Illinois there is a rural county, McHenry County, which is included in the Chicago consolidated statistical metropolitan area. That means residents in and around McHenry County who work in this rural area without sidewalks or mass transit system must car pool. This is a federally mandated car pooling and it is an outrage.

When the amendments of the Clean Air Act were passed in 1990, I was not a Member of this body, and to the best of my knowledge there was never any formal debate on this issue in the House; never any specific hearings on the issue before it was simply slipped in to the Clean Air Act amendments.

This past Sunday, Illinois Governor Edgar and I took the bold and courageous step of announcing a moratorium on the federally mandated employee commute option. He has directed the Illinois Department of Transportation not to enforce this measure. Why? An assistant administrator for the EPA admitted that air emissions reductions are, quote, "minuscule," and her agency has stated it simply does not intend to enforce the mandate.

This moratorium now puts Illinois in the same situation as Pennsylvania and Texas which have announced that they will not participate in enforcing the mandate. There is only one catch, Mr. Speaker: the employee trip reduction mandate is the law. The EPA may choose to not enforce it. The States may not enforce it. However, there is nothing to keep a Federal judge from enforcing it.

No, the mandate is clear. It is law. It says that businesses with over 100 employees shall participate and decrease